

M. VAN SMITH (SBN 32007)
1696 Mendenhall Drive
San Jose, California 95130
Telephone (408) 364-1062
E-mail: mvsmit@sbccglobal.net

Attorney for Plaintiff

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

MITCHELL J. PLAINTIFF, D.C., M.S.,
L.Ac..

Plaintiff,

vs.

CAROL ROMEO, et al..

Defendants.

Case No.: C02 04011 RMW

**ORDER FOR PERMISSION TO
SUBMIT BRIEF OVER 25 PAGES IN
OPPOSITION TO RULE 12(b)(6)
MOTION TO DISMISS BY
DEFENDANTS CAROL ROMEO; JAMES
SHARP; VIVIEN HERSH; LYDIA ZANE;
JOEL PRIMES; R. LLOYD FREISEN,
D.C.; MICHAEL MARTELLO, D.C.;
LLOYD BOLAND, D.C., DEBORAH E.
PATE, D.C.; JOHN BOVEE, D.C.;
SHARON UFBERG, D.C.; JEFFREY
STEINHARDT, D.C.; STEPHEN
FOREMAN, D.C.; JACALYN
BEUTTNER, D.C.; CRAIG MISSAKIAN,
J.D.; JOHN DERONDED, D.C.; M.
ELIZABETH WARE; ROBERT
BOURKE; GAYLYN MACHADO; C.
BRETT SULLIVAN, D.C.; LAWRENCE
MERCER; PETER BERMAN, D.C.;
PATRICIA BRICKMAN**

Date: October 14, 2005

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 6 — Fourth Floor

Judge: The Honorable Ronald M. Whyte

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-4(b), Plaintiff requests permission to file brief in excess of 25 pages. State Defendants submitted a 26 page memorandum that incorporated a previously written 25 page memorandum in its entirety, giving Plaintiff a total of 50 pages of memoranda to respond to. In addition, State Defendants incorporated by reference a previously submitted request for judicial notice that is more than an inch thick. Although several of State Defendants arguments are supported by a paucity of authority, Plaintiff's opposition is supported by an

1 abundance of authority. It takes more space to cite and explain the application of existent
2 authority than it does to cite to no authorities. There are new issues in State Defendants' brief
3 that have not been argued before. Finally, the decisions on issues State Defendants raise hinge
4 on a full understanding of the facts of the case, which span a decade, and how these several
5 specific fact patterns involving various combinations of 25 defendants, provide specific
6 exceptions to the immunities State Defendants wish could be broadly mis-applied to them. Just
7 reciting the facts so that the lack of immunity is clear with regard to each of 25 defendants takes
8 paragraphs. Defendants made no attempt to elucidate these facts in their papers.

9 Dated: September 22, 2005

10 _____
11 M. VAN SMITH
12 Attorney for Plaintiff
13
14

ORDER

15 Upon the application of Plaintiff, and finding good cause therefore, the court grants
16 Plaintiff permission to file a brief up to 35 pages in length. The Court does not intend to (rmw)
17 consider defendant's incorporated by reference brief.

18 Dated: 9/27/05

19 _____
20 /S/ RONALD M. WHYTE
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Ronald M. Whyte
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE